

"the Weaverville townsite; said portions of said lots being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a 1-inch iron pipe set in the ground at a point south 46 degrees 55 minutes east 148.28 feet from corner numbered 1 in the survey of lot numbered 47 in township 33 north, range 10 west, Mount Diablo base and meridian; a 1-inch iron pipe set in the ground bears south 41 degrees 40 minutes west 146.13 feet; running thence, first north 41 degrees 40 minutes east 32.41 feet; second from a tangent that bears south 49 degrees 51 minutes 05 seconds east, on a curve to the right with a radius of 1,800 feet, through a central angle of 3 degrees 08 minutes 50 seconds, a distance of 98.72 feet to a point on the southeast boundary of lot 2 in block numbered 13 of the townsite of Weaverville, Trinity County, California, which point bears south 31 degrees 43 minutes west 50.47 feet from the centerline of State highway at engineers' station 806+89.71 P.O.C.; third south 31 degrees 43 minutes west 130.63 feet on the boundary of said block numbered 13 to the southeast corner of said lot numbered 1 in block numbered 13; fourth south 89 degrees 39 minutes west 154.00 feet on the boundary of said lot 1; fifth north 41 degrees 40 minutes east 191.71 feet to the point of beginning. Containing 0.462 acre, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO SUSANVILLE, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2250) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from California give us an explanation of this transfer, again a transfer of land without consideration?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As the gentleman from Michigan knows, last year we also passed this bill in the House. The Forest Service was going to locate their Lassen National Forest headquarters in Lassen County, Calif., and the National Forest Service chose the city of Susanville. At that time the city and a number of individual citizens got together and donated a parcel of land for the construction of this facility. In the meantime, the Forest Service decided to go elsewhere and they located their facilities on another site. At the present time the city is asking for this site back for the construction of a city firehouse in the city of Susanville. They donated this property to the Federal Government in the first instance, and today they are asking for the return of it since the Federal Government is not going to use it for the purpose for which it was given.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Susanville, California, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following lands which were previously donated to the United States by C. D. Mathews and Ethel M. Mathews, his wife, by deed dated December 6, 1939, and recorded in book 38 of deeds, at page 218, in the records of Lassen County, California:

All those certain lots, pieces and parcels of land situate, lying, and being in the county of Lassen, State of California, and particularly described as follows, to wit:

PARCEL 1. Commencing at the corner common to sections 29, 30, 31 and 32, in township 30 north, range 12 east, of the Mount Diablo base and meridian; thence north 89 degrees 22 minutes east along the section line 497.37 feet; thence south 16 degrees 50 minutes west 1,908.58 feet to the point of intersection of the centerline of Roop Street with the centerline of Main Street of the city of Susanville; thence south 73 degrees 10 minutes east along said centerline of Main Street 1,525.6 feet to the centerline of Weatherlow Street of said city; thence continuing along said centerline of Main Street of said city south 73 degrees 08 minutes 15 seconds east 1,264.25 feet; thence continuing along said centerline of Main Street south 73 degrees 37 minutes 15 seconds east 445.12 feet; thence north 19 degrees 52 minutes 45 seconds east 40.07 feet to the northerly line of the California State Highway and the true point of beginning; running thence north 19 degrees 52 minutes 45 seconds east 229.20 feet; thence south 73 degrees 07 minutes 15 seconds east 115.0 feet; thence south 15 degrees 22 minutes 45 seconds west 227.80 feet to the northerly right of way line of the California State Highway, and thence north 73 degrees 37 minutes 15 seconds west along the said northerly right of way line to the California State Highway, a distance of 136 feet to the true point of beginning.

PARCEL 2. Lots numbered 1, 2, and 3 of block numbered 18 of the east addition to the city of Susanville, as shown on the map entitled "Map of East Addition to Susanville, Lassen County, California", filed in the office of the county recorder of Lassen County, California, January 6, 1911.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 3, strike out "to" and insert "of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF JUDGMENTS AND COMPROMISE SETTLEMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6835) to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2414 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read:

"§ 2414. Payment of judgments and compromise settlements

"Payment of final judgments rendered by a district court against the United States shall be made on settlements by the General Accounting Office. Payment of final

judgments rendered by a State or foreign court or tribunal against the United States, or against its agencies or officials upon obligations or liabilities of the United States, shall be made on settlements by the General Accounting Office after certification by the Attorney General that it is in the interest of the United States to pay the same.

"Whenever the Attorney General determines that no appeal shall be taken from a judgment or that no further review will be sought from a decision affirming the same, he shall so certify and the judgment shall be deemed final.

"Except as otherwise provided by law, compromise settlements of claims referred to the Attorney General for defense of imminent litigation or suits against the United States, or against its agencies or officials upon obligations or liabilities of the United States, made by the Attorney General or any person authorized by him, shall be settled and paid in a manner similar to judgments in like causes and appropriations or funds available for the payment of such judgments are hereby made available for the payment of such compromise settlements."

Sec. 2. The last item in the analysis of chapter 161 of such title is amended to read: "2414. Payment of judgments and compromise settlements."

Sec. 3. Section 1302 of the Act of July 27, 1956 (70 Stat. 694; 31 U.S.C. 724a), is amended by deleting the words "judgments (not in excess of \$100,000 in any one case) rendered by the district courts and the Court of Claims against the United States which have become final" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "final judgments and compromise settlements (not in excess of \$100,000, or its equivalent in foreign currencies at the time of payment, in any one case) which are payable in accordance with the terms of sections 2414 or 2517 of title 28, United States Code".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINNESOTA-NORTH DAKOTA BOUNDARY LINE COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7189) granting the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary between such States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary between such States as set forth in the Act of North Dakota designated as house bill numbered 587, as approved by the Governor of such State on February 4, 1961, and as set forth in chapter 236, session laws 1961 of the State of Minnesota.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF ESPIONAGE LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2730) to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9911

application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] to explain to the House the basis or the need for this legislation.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, twice before this legislation under the sponsorship of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] passed the House of Representatives but died in the other body. Had this legislation been on the books, Mr. Scarbeck who was recently apprehended and who will be indicted for certain offenses alleged to have been committed abroad would have been subject to prosecution under the anti-espionage act.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the case just mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] dramatizes the need for this legislation because were it not for the fact that this traitor was an employee of the United States, there would be no statute under which he could be prosecuted. That is the very reason why this legislation is so badly needed. May I say it is a mystery to me why the other body has sat on this badly needed legislation for so long.

The House cannot be blamed for the delay in placing this urgently needed legislation on the statute books.

May I remind my colleagues that the Attorney General of the United States first requested the enactment of this legislation by letter to the Speaker of the House of Representatives dated July 29, 1958. The Speaker referred the communication to our committee, the bill was introduced on August 5, 1958 and reported to the House in just one week's time, on August 12, 1958. It passed the House by unanimous consent 6 days later, on August 18, 1958 and reached the Senate on that very day.

No action was taken in the Senate by the time the 85th Congress adjourned.

In the 86th Congress, I introduced the bill on February 4, 1959 and the subcommittee of which I am the chairman reported it to the full committee on the next day, February 5, 1959. The bill passed the House, again by unanimous consent, on March 2, 1959.

The 86th Congress remained in session until September 1, 1960, which means that the other body had the remaining 6 months of the first session and all of the 8 months of the second session of the 86th Congress to take action.

As the House has just been informed, no action was taken. This is why we have the bill before us again today.

Mr. FORD. In the 85th and 86th Congresses, this identical bill was approved in the House; is that not correct?

Mr. POFF. That is true.

Mr. FORD. And no action in either instances was taken in the other body. Does the gentleman feel that there is a possibility that the other body will now consider this legislation and act affirmatively on it?

Mr. POFF. I am inclined to believe that in view of the Scarbeck case the other body will recognize the urgent need for this legislation and will act affirmatively in this session of the Congress. May I emphasize what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just stated. If Mr. Scarbeck had not been a Government official and had been only a private citizen, he would have been completely immune to any prosecution whatever. Under the Internal Security Act of 1950, Mr. Scarbeck will, upon conviction, be subject to a maximum penalty of \$10,000 fine and 10 years in jail, either or both. If this bill were on the statute books, he would be subject to a maximum penalty of death or imprisonment for life or for any term of years.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 791 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 37 of such title is amended by deleting the following: "791. Scope of chapter."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL SECRETARY OF LABOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6882) to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So the gentleman can make a talk? If that is what he wishes, I will be glad to.

Mr. BAILEY. I wanted to make an explanation rather than a talk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the right to object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. That is what I am going to do when the gentleman gets through.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and also in the absence of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], who is chairman of the subcommittee that handled this legislation, I think we should take advantage of the opportunity at this time to have the sponsor of the legislation, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], explain why this legislation is essential and necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentlewoman from Washington?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the reason for the bill is clearly set forth in the report. It was introduced at the request of the administration and was presented in behalf of the increased number of women who are part of the work force across the entire United States.

If you will turn to page 2 of the report on the bill you will find these precise reasons set forth. President Kennedy in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, stated:

This bill, H.R. 6882, will better enable the Department of Labor to meet its increasing responsibilities in connection with the growing role of women in the work force of the Nation.

In describing the need for this bill Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg has stated:

The Department of Labor is faced with the need for meeting the challenge of employing the skills of women workers as effectively as possible * * * an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, whom I can designate to supervise the work of the Department of Labor relating to women workers, would materially aid the Department in fulfilling its mission.

I have been informed by the Department of Labor that an estimated 6 million more women workers will be required by 1970 to meet growing consumer needs, an increase of 25 percent as compared to 15-percent increase for men.

The need for enactment of H.R. 6882 arises from this increasingly essential role of women in our labor force, and from the expanding responsibility of the Department of Labor to stimulate appropriate action necessary for safeguarding the welfare of women workers and for providing the opportunity for full realization of their abilities.

Finally, may I add there is increasing necessity to develop the skills of our displaced women and our older women, and make for them the best possible in society so that they make their fullest contribution to our Nation.

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mrs. HANSEN) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mrs. GREEN of Oregon's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Committee on Government Operations has Reorganization Plan No. 5 under consideration, under which this matter can be taken up, and inasmuch as the Committee on Education and Labor is holding hearings on the same subject, I will have to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REIMBURSEMENT OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 74) to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip